

Remarks

In the non-final Office Action mailed February 22, 2008, claims 1-15 are pending. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-15. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections herein.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-13, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,097,518 (Scott). The Applicants submit that claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-13, and 16 are novel over Scott.

Claim 1 in the pending application, paraphrased herein, discloses a method for providing a halftoned image. Using the method, a halftone image is scaled by performing pixel repetitions utilizing an error diffusion algorithm. The Examiner has suggested that Scott teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner has suggested that FIG. 4B in addition to column 19, lines 46-52 in Scott teaches scaling a halftone image by performing pixel repetition using error diffusion. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Wikipedia (en.wikipedia.org) defines error diffusion as "a type of halftoning in which the quantization residual is distributed to neighboring pixels which have not yet been processed." The Applicants submit that although Scott may label the title of FIG. 4B as indicating an error diffusion process, error diffusion as understood by one skilled in the art is not being performed (i.e. no error is being distributed to pixels in the scaled image of FIG. 4B as suggested by the title of the drawing).

FIG. 4B of Scott illustrates a method for scaling a source image 450 to an enlarged image 490. Source image 450 contains single pixels 451-456. Enlarged image 490 contains pixel blocks 463, 467, 473, and 477. In creating the pixel blocks in enlarged image 490, Scott indicates that the value of individual pixels from source image 450 are merely replicated a number of times to generate the pixel blocks 463, 467, 473, and 477 in enlarged image 490 (Column 16, lines 6-29). For example, single pixel 451 in source image 450 is replicated 3 times as indicated by line 461 to form pixels 463(1), 463(2), and 463(3). The Applicants submit that the recited steps indicated by FIG. 4B of Scott are not distributing error through an error diffusion algorithm as recited in claim 1 of the pending application. Scott simply replicates source pixels (i.e. makes multiple copies of source pixels) to generate enlarged image 490. Applicants therefore submit that claim 1 is novel over Scott. Independent claim 6 and 12, and

dependent claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13 and 16 novel for at least the same reasons as provided above.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 3-4, 9-10, and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Scott in further view of U.S. Patent 6,563,957 (Li). The Applicants submit that dependent claims 3-4, 9-10, and 14-15 are non-obvious in view of the combination of Scott and Li for at least the reasons provided above.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1-16 are novel and non-obvious in view of the cited art, and respectfully ask the Examiner to allow claims 1-16.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 22, 2008

/Brett L. Bornsen/

Brett L. Bornsen, Reg. No. 46,566
Duft, Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)